Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/932,539	MCINTOSH, GAVIN J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shane Bomar	3672
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Amended</u>	
(1) <u>Shane Bomar</u> .	(3)	
(2) Henry Query.	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>17 November 2005</u>	Time: <u>2pm</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed: 8-13		
Prior art documents discussed: US patent 5,544,707 to Hopper et al		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa</li> </ul>	ne examiner will provide a write record of the substance of the	ten summary of the substance e interview, since the interview
		·
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicar	nt/Applicant's Representative S	Signature – if appropriate)

¥

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Attorney Query was contacted in response to the amendment filed on 9/15/2005. In view of said amendment, it was determined that claims 1-7 are allowable over the previously cited prior art. However, it was noted that Hopper et al anticipates all of the limitations of independent claim 8. Mr. Query then suggested claim language for claim 8 to distinguish the Applicant's invention from that of the patent. It was agreed that this amendment would distinguish the claim from the prior art of record, and it was agreed to implement said changes via an Examiner's amendment.